

**REMARKS**

This Amendment, filed in response to the Advisory Action mailed August 20, 2009, is believed to be fully responsive to all of the issues raised in the Actions. Favorable reconsideration on the merits and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

**Claim Status**

Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 7-9 are canceled and claims 1, 3-6, and 10-14 are all the claims pending in the application.

**Response to Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner appears to allege that the cited art teaches the claimed ratio between the synthetic natural rubber and the total rubber loading.

Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that the disclosures of the cited references fail to teach or suggest the specifically claimed ratio between the synthetic natural rubber and the total rubber loading.

Instant claim 1 is characterized in that a ratio by mass of (A) the synthetic polyisoprene rubber to a total of (A) the synthetic polyisoprene rubber and (B) the natural rubber is 5-60 mass%. When the ratio of (A) the synthetic polyisoprene rubber is less than 5 mass%, the effect by compounding (A) the synthetic polyisoprene rubber is little and the balance between the dynamic properties and the processability is not improved, while when the ratio of (A) the synthetic polyisoprene rubber exceeds 60 mass%, the wear resistance and the durability of the rubber composition are deteriorated and also the adhesion property to a roll is deteriorated. (See

paragraph [0019] bridging pages 5-6 of the specification). These unexpected results are not taught or suggested in any of the cited references.

Furthermore, Applicants submit herewith a Rule 1.132 Declaration by Mr. Suzuki. The Declaration includes comparative compositions in which both natural rubber and cis 1,4 polyisoprene are included and the amount of polyisoprene is below 5% and greater than 60%, as compared to the total rubber loading. It is clear from Mr. Suzuki's declaration that when the ratio of (A) the synthetic polyisoprene rubber is less than 5 mass%, the effect by compounding (A) the synthetic polyisoprene rubber is little and the processability is hardly improved, and therefore the balance between the dynamic properties and the processability is not improved, while when the ratio of (A) the synthetic polyisoprene rubber is more than 60 mass%, the wear resistance and the durability of the rubber composition are deteriorated.

Further, Applicants submit that claims 3-6 and 10-14, all of which depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1 are patentable for the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable. Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections of claims 1, 3-6, and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are not sustainable and withdrawal is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)  
U.S. Application No.: 10/562,947

Attorney Docket No.: Q92273

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Bruce E. Kramer  
Registration No. 33,725

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 8, 2009